**Gender AC V2**

I affirm and begin with the words of Nawal[[1]](#endnote-1), an Iraqi woman who experienced first-hand the repressive nature of sanctions. “The embargo is ‘evil’. It took everything from us. It has battered our lives mercilessly.” Thihan Nyun[[2]](#endnote-2) explains the definition of economic sanctions commonly accepted in academic fields,

Economic sanctions can be defined, depending on the particular role one would like sanctions to play in international affairs, in two different ways. Economic sanctions can either encompass every measure designed to inflict economic deprivation or include only the most comprehensive of embargoes imposed for well-defined political reasons. A broad definition based solely on the ends would take into consideration only the economic deprivation inflicted upon a target country, and not the means employed to bring about that deprivation. As a result, any measure - economic or military - that disrupts the economic activity of an adversary would qualify as an economic sanction. Conversely, **a definition based on the means, which is commonly accepted today, narrows the scope of what constitutes economic sanctions by focusing only on trade-disrupting measures.** Hufbauer and colleagues define economic sanctions as "the deliberate, government-inspired withdrawal, or threat of withdrawal, of customary trade or financial relations." **A further synthesis of the literature reveals the following definition,** which will be used for this Article: **economic sanctions are the** actual or threatened **withdrawal of normal trade or financial relations, imposed** by the sender against the target, **for foreign policy purposes.** Under this approach, **economic sanctions are limited to restrictions on trade, investment, and other cross-border economic activity that reduce[s] the target country's revenues, thereby facilitating the desired change without resorting to military action.**

Prefer this definition for two reasons:

1. Nyun synthesizes the academic literature, and determines this to be the commonly accepted definition, meaning it is not an isolated decree from a single expert, but an academic norm.
2. The use of economic restrictions to make it physically impossible for a target to take some action, such as arms embargoes or non-punitive asset freezes, does not fit the ‘sanction’ component of the term ‘economic sanctions’ because sanctions, whether used in the international or domestic legal sense, are punishments rather than any coercive, preventative acts.

Moreover, even if this is not the preferable definition, its acceptance in academic literature proves reasonability. So, if the negative proves that an alternate definition is preferable, the fairest course of action is to evaluate the round using the new definition, but not punish me with a loss as I’m being reasonable. Prefer reasonable affirmative definitions absent real and significant abuse because changing definitions in the middle of the round dissolves the full 1AC strategy and 6 minutes of affirmative speech time which is a far greater loss to the affirmative than the use of a reasonable and non-abusive definition is to the negative.

Because the resolution asks whether an action is acceptable, I value **morality**. “Ought” implies moral obligation because what is “desirable” can only be determined when couched in some ethical system. There is no such thing as independent desirability because it begs the question of how we determine what is desirable. Since moral worth doesn’t differ based on attributes we have no control over, such as gender, gender-based oppression is contrary to morality. Thus, the criterion is **minimizing the oppression of women**. This is the best standard for four additional reasons:

1. Focusing on the women who bear the burden of sanctions is critical to understanding their true effect and preventing hierarchical social structures that wrongfully distinguish between people who are moral equals. We can never truly understand sanctions by focusing on the aggregate. Drury and Peksen[[3]](#endnote-3) write,

Why pay attention to the gender-specific effects of economic coercion? First, **a better way of understanding the damage inflicted by sanctions** on target countries **is to go beyond an aggregate level of analysis and analyze directly the groups who bear the burden of economic shocks due their vulnerable** socio-economic and political **status. Women are among the most vulnerable groups** across countries **owing to their relative lack of adequate access to education, economic power, and voice over economic and political decision-making** mechanisms. The **underrepresentation of women in the key spheres of life** thereby **inhibits female political and socio-economic empowerment, which allows the persistence of hierarchical social structures** (Norris and Inglehart 2000; Coleman 2004; Caprioli 2004a), **making them more likely pay a high price as sanctions disrupt** the **economic and political stability** of target countries.

2. Using the lens of gender to analyze economic sanctions rather than a state-centric approach is crucial to understanding and long term prosperity and good governance. Drury and Peksen[[4]](#endnote-4) 2 write,

**The** second **value of paying particular attention to the impact sanctions have on women is that the study brings a gender-based approach to the study of economic statecraft. Existing works on economic sanctions tend to be state-centric and largely neglect the insight from gender specific theoretical and empirical perspectives**. Similarly, the literature on the international dimensions of women’s rights addressed the role of several international factors, such as economic globalization (Gray et al 2007; Neumayer and De Soysa 2007; Richards and Gelleny 2007) and the use of force (Meintjes et al. 2001; Moser and Clarke 2001; Enloe 2000; Tickner 2001; Caprioli and Douglass 2008). Yet, this literature neglects the gendered consequences of non-violent policy tools including economic sanctions. **Because advancing women’s status is crucial to promoting more economic prosperity and good governance** (Boserup 1970; Seguino 2000; Inglehart et al. 2002; Coleman 2004), **it is important that we fully understand the impact foreign policy tools have on women’s status.** Hence, a gender-based analysis highlights the importance of global social phenomenon—women’s status and female empowerment—and offers insight as to how coercive diplomacy in the form of economic sanctions is detrimental to women.

3. Ignoring the gender-specific impact of policies in favor of focusing on other issues perpetuates the oppression of patriarchy and ensures continued violence in the international arena. Tickner[[5]](#endnote-5) writes,

Extending Scott's challenge to the field of international relations, we can immediately detect a similar set of hierarchical binary oppositions. But **in spite of the seemingly obvious association of international politics with** the **masculine characteristics** described above**, the field of international relations is one of the last of the social sciences to be touched by** gender analysis and **feminist perspectives**. 11 The reason for this, I believe, is not that **the field** is gender neutral, meaning that the introduction of gender is irrelevant to its subject matter as many scholars believe, but that **it is so thoroughly masculinized that the workings of these hierarchical gender relations are hidden.** Framed in its own set of binary distinctions, **the discipline of international relations assumes similarly hierarchical relationships** when it posits an anarchic world "outside" to be defended against through the accumulation and rational use of power. In political discourse, **this becomes translated into stereotypical notions about those who inhabit the outside. Like women, foreigners are frequently portrayed as "the other":** nonwhites and tropical countries are often depicted as irrational, emotional, and unstable, characteristics that are also attributed to women. **The construction of this discourse and the way in which we are taught to think about international politics closely parallel the way in which we are socialized into understanding gender differences. To ignore these hierarchical constructions and their relevance to power is therefore to risk perpetuating these relationships of domination and subordination.** But before beginning to describe what the field of international relations might look like if gender were included as a central category of analysis, I shall give a brief historical overview of the field as it has traditionally been constructed.

4. Patriarchal oppression is the root cause of war. Reardon[[6]](#endnote-6) writes, (ellipsis in original)

In an article entitled “Naming the Cultural Forces That Push Us toward War” (1983), Charlene Spretnak focused on some of the fundamental cultural factors that deeply influence ways of thinking about security. She argues that **patriarchy encourages militarist tendencies.** Since a major war now could easily bring on massive annihilation of almost unthinkable proportions, why are discussions in our national forums addressing the madness of the nuclear arms race limited to matters of hardware and statistics? A more comprehensive analysis is badly needed . . . **A clearly visible element in the escalating tensions among militarized nations is the** macho posturing and the **patriarchal ideal of dominance**, not parity, **which motivates** defense ministers and government **leaders to “strut their stuff” as we watch with increasing horror.** Most men in our patriarchal culture are still acting out old patterns that are radically inappropriate for the nuclear age. **To prove dominance and control, to distance one’s character from that of women**, to survive the toughest violent initiation, **to shed the sacred blood of the hero**, to collaborate with death in order to hold it at bay**—all of these patriarchal pressures** on men **have traditionally reached resolution** in ritual fashion **on the battlefield.** But there is no longer any battlefield. Does anyone seriously believe that if a nuclear power were losing a crucial, large-scale conventional war it would refrain from using its multiple-warhead nuclear missiles because of some diplomatic agreement? The military theater of a nuclear exchange today would extend, instantly or eventually, to all living things, all the air, all the soil, all the water. **If we believe that war is a “necessary evil,” that patriarchal assumptions are simply “human nature,” then we are locked into a lie, paralyzed. The ultimate result of unchecked terminal patriarchy will be nuclear holocaust. The causes of recurrent warfare** are not biological. Neither are they solely economic. They **are** also **a result of patriarchal ways of thinking, which** historically have generated considerable pressure for standing armies to be used. (Spretnak 1983) These cultural tendencies **have produced our current crisis of a highly militarized, violent world that** in spite of the decline of the cold war and the slowing of the military race between the superpowers **is still staring into the abyss of nuclear disaster**, as described by a leading feminist in an address to the Community Aid Abroad State Convention, Melbourne, Australia.

My THESIS and SOLE CONTENTION is that economic sanctions disproportionately further the oppression of women.

First, sanctions greatly reduce welfare services, which deteriorates female empowerment. Drury and Peksen[[7]](#endnote-7) 3 write,

**Economic sanctions** also **reduce the** target **government’s ability to provide welfare services, including** state-supported **education, health care, childcare, maternity leaves, and** other social policies such as family/child cash and **tax benefits. Such policies** offered by the welfare state are often recognized as “women-friendly” because they **help women gain access to education, create opportunities to work** and participate in labor force, **enjoy healthy life**, and lessen some of the economic burden of child bearing and household responsibilities (Hernes 1987; Lewis 1998; Sainsbury 1999; Pearson 2003). Economic sanctions indirectly hurt women’s access to welfare services by reducing the government’s ability to sponsor social policies as revenues from international trade and financial exchanges decline and private economic actors fail to pay enough taxes due to the economic downturn. Scholars also suggest that economic sanctions indirectly contribute to the decline of welfare services because political elites—who control the supply and redistribution of public resources—often cut social spending, including welfare service expenses, to redirect the state’s resources in their favor to survive foreign economic pressures (Weiss et al 1997; Gibbons 1999; Cortright et al 2001; Cortright and Lopez 2000). **Because women** are among the groups who **benefit most from the welfare state, any decline in welfare** policy **provision caused by** the **sanctions will contribute to the deterioration of female empowerment.**

Second, sanctions intensify patriarchal control and violence against women. Rosenblum[[8]](#endnote-8) et al give the example of Iraq,

**Patriarchal control** also **intensified under** the **sanctions, resulting in increased violence** across the board. **The rise in domestic violence was a result of** the **economic uncertainty and left women more vulnerable than ever before. Since responsibility for divorced women reverted back to already-struggling relatives, there was** additional family **pressure to remain in abusive relationships.** Many **families were unable to support** their more **vulnerable members, and structural violence increased as women were forced into prostitution and begging for survival.** Street violence, including abductions and gang activity, also became more common. This state of fear and violence affected women’s psychological well-being and many women began to veil themselves or wear shapeless garments as protection against being harassed or attacked. The lack of basic essentials causes high levels of stress “resulting from the inability of people to act upon their circumstances to remove or mitigate the source of such tensions” (121)

Third, sanctions ruin women’s rights laws. Sjoberg[[9]](#endnote-9) explains,

Before the economic sanctions, many sanctioned nations were relatively prosperous economically. Now, the economic turmoil brought about by sanctions is destroying social networks. **The area of women’s rights is** one **where the disintegration of Iraq’s social structures is obvious.** Human Rights Watch reports that **women’s rights laws** exist in Iraq, and **were enforced before the embargo, however,** “reports indicate that **the application of these laws has declined as Iraq’s economic and political crisis persists.”**66 In Iraq, **the severe economic crisis caused by sanctions hurts the creation and enforcement of** social programs, like **wymyn’s rights laws.** In addition to the legal recognition of their rights suffering, **the quality of women’s lives** in Iraq **has decreased as a result of sanctions. A lack of vitamins and supplies makes it impossible to get adequate prenatal care** for women. After their children are born, women have trouble finding ways to provide for their families. As food shortages plague families, Simons reports “**women** typically **go hungry to provide for their children and elderly relatives**.

Fourth, sanctions strengthen governments while forcing women into the sex industry with no hope of escape. Khanlarzadeh[[10]](#endnote-10) writes,

**An**other **obstacle to the Iranian women's rights movement is economic sanctions.** This issue has been less prominent for two primary reasons. The first is that the government is not willing to make clear how sanctions affect the lives of Iranians, since the government does not wish to admit its susceptibility to foreign powers. The second reason is that those who oppose the government of Iran are not willing to portray the latter as the victim of the story. Of course, the real victims of the sanctions are the people of Iran. "The impact of U.S. economic sanctions has been significant in reducing Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), in raising Iran's cost of capital, and in delaying the exploitation of Caspian Sea oil and gas" (Hossein Askari, Foreign Policy Forum Archives: "The Iranian Paradox: Economic Failure, Regional Resurgence, and an Opportunity for Dialogue"). The **oil profits, the major income of the country, are distributed by the government. Sanctions,** through a reduction of the FDI, **actually strengthen the government, which decides on the diminished wealth distribution.** Sanctions also result in increased unemployment for working class women and men. "Ordinary businesses have been hard hit, too, according to Western officials and Iranians. Big **companies** and small bazaaris—as traditional merchants are called in Iran—**are increasingly forced to pay for imports in advance**, in cash. **Exporters are losing clients; raw materials for non-oil industries are harder to pay for**" (New York Times, October 31, 2008). **Women, more vulnerable to economic crises, often are the first to lose their jobs.** In this climate with decreased job opportunities, **poor women, lacking other avenues of support, may turn to prostitution in order to survive.** In fact, **the number of Iranian women who work in prostitution is increasing and their average age is decreasing.** During my visit in Iran I often heard stories about **women** who **offered grocery store owners sex in exchange for food.**

This is not unique to Iran. Sanctions have caused a huge number of Burmese women to lose their jobs, forcing them into prostitution and risking death. Howlett[[11]](#endnote-11) writes,

Preliminary reports have indicated negative effects on the civilian population of Burma as a result of the sanctions. n172 The **sanctions have already reportedly caused 400,000 layoffs in the textile industry, and reports predict that 100,000 Burmese - mainly women working in the textile industry - stand to lose their jobs as a result of sanctions**,. n173 **Many women who have already lost their jobs in the textile industry have been forced into prostitution**. n174 As Nicholas Kristof has pointed out, **this will cause many of these women to die from AIDS.**

These harmful impacts of economic sanctions to women are not only empirically proven in application but is also statistically verified. The evidence is overwhelming. Sanctioned countries are 98% more likely to score on the bottom half of the scale measuring women’s economic status. Using time-series cross-sectional data from 1971 to 2000, encompassing 142 countries, and controlling for GDP, economic openness, regime type, war, and other variables, Drury and Peksen[[12]](#endnote-12) 4 found that,

**The results lend strong and robust support to** both hypotheses. Beginning with **the** first **hypothesis**—**that sanctions will be detrimental to women’s economic status**—the results, appearing in Table 1 below, show that **the presence of economic sanctions tends to reduce both women’s economic conditions** (as measured by CIRI) **and the percentage of women in the total labor force.** In the first column, **the model estimates that** the probability of a country scoring a 2 or 3—denoting high levels of economic status for women—is 51% when no sanctions are in place. However, once sanctions are imposed, the probability falls to only 1%. Thus, **when a country is sanctioned, its respect for women’s economic rights is 98% likely to fall into the bottom half of the scale.**

And, sanctions not only hurt economic rights, but also greatly harm women’s social and political rights. Drury and Peksen write,

We now turn to the analysis of the second hypothesis, that sanctions will reduce the respect for women’s political and social rights. In the first column of Table 2, we display the effect sanctions have on the social status of women. The results are completely consistent with the earlier findings—**sanctions reduce the respect for women’s social rights,** and that effect is conditioned by wealth and regime type. **While the probability of a high level of respect for women’s social rights** (scoring a 2 or 3) **in the non-sanctioned countries is 77%, it is only 14% for the sanctioned countries.** Hence, we find that **once a country is targeted with foreign economic pressure the probability of respect for women’s political rights declines by 82%.**

Such social and political rights include the right to vote, join political parties, have an education, initiate a divorce, and freedom from force sterilization and genital mutilation without consent. Minimizing violations of such crucial women’s rights is key to resisting gender-based oppression.

Thus, because I believe in resisting oppression against Nawal, and the many thousands of women whose lives are battered by sanctions as we speak, I affirm.
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